

2. This Contempt petition was filed in L.P.A. No. 324 of 2002. The contention of the petitioner is that this court had passed a status-quo order on 17.12.2002 in Civil Application No. 371 of 2002, whereby the respondent No. 1 was not supposed to pass any order. Contrary to the order of the status-quo, however, the respondent No.1 passed an order on 28.1.2003 interfering with the statusquo order and therefore he committed contempt.

3. Initially Civil Contempt Petition No. 90 of 2003 was filed and the court ordered issue of notice to the respondents on 11.3.2003. But there is an order dated 17.4.2003 deleting the name of the respondent No.1 from the proceedings. Respondent No.1 is the Authority who alleged to have committed contempt of the court.

4. Thereafter as per the Court's Order, Civil Contempt Petition No. 90 of 2003 was converted into Criminal Contempt Petition No. 35 of 2006.

5. The question is once the respondent No.1 was deleted from civil proceedings, whether he can be deemed to have continued as respondent in this criminal proceedings. There is no such order. Atleast nothing is brought to our notice that so far as criminal proceedings are concerned, the respondent No.1 was ordered to be there in the present petition as respondent No.1. If the respondent No.1 is not there as a consequence of the aforesaid order dated 17.4.2003 then technically nothing survives in this petition. Contempt Petition is disposed of accordingly.

:3:

(SMT. NISHITA MHATRE, J.)

(D.G. DESHPANDE, J.)